

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present patent application are respectfully requested in view of the following amendments and remarks. Upon entry of the present Reply, Claims 1-12, 18, 19 and 21-33 are pending in this application. Claims 1-12, 18, 19 and 21-30 stand rejected. Claims 1-4, 7-10, 18, 19 and 21-30 have been amended. Claims 31-33 are newly added. Applicant submits that upon entry of the present Reply, Claims 1-12, 18, 19 and 21-33 are in condition for allowance. Moreover, Applicant submits that no new matter has been introduced by the foregoing amendments.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-4, 7-10 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141 to Bezos et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Bezos”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,014,644 to Erickson (hereinafter referred to as “Erickson”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,717 to Wiecha (hereinafter referred to as “Wiecha”). Claims 5, 6, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bezos in view of Erickson and further in view of Wiecha and U.S. Patent No. 6,668,354 to Chen et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Chen”). Claims 19 and 21-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bezos in view of Wiecha and U.S. Patent No. 5,960,411 to Hartman et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Hartman”).

Applicant respectfully traverses each of these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent Claims 1, 7, 18, 19 and 23 are the independent claims presently under consideration. None of the cited references, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest every element recited in independent Claims 1, 7, 18, 19 and 23.

The rejection of Claims 1-4, 7-10 and 18 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bezos in view of Erickson and further in view of Wiecha, is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 1 recites:

receiving a purchase request at said hub server, wherein said purchase request originated at one of said affiliate web sites and includes a buyer identifier, an affiliate web site identifier and at least one of a product identifier and a category identifier; combining a plurality of information associated with said buyer identifier and stored within said buyer profile database with said purchase request received from one of said affiliate web sites to facilitate creating combined purchase order information; and forwarding said combined purchase order information from said hub server to one of said multiple vendors, such that said purchase request is completed while said buyer is on said affiliate web site.

Amended Claim 7 recites:

receiving a purchase request at said hub server, wherein said purchase request originated at one of said affiliate web sites and includes a buyer identifier, an affiliate web site identifier and at least one of a product identifier and a category identifier; combining stored buyer billing and shipping information of said particular buyer with said purchase request received from one of said affiliate web sites to facilitate creating combined purchase order information; recording said combined purchase order information at said hub server; and forwarding said combined purchase order information from said hub server to one of said multiple vendors.

Claim 18 recites:

receiving at said hub server from one of said affiliate web sites a purchase request of said particular buyer for a selected product; combining said stored buyer billing and shipping information of said particular buyer with said selected product information received from said affiliate web site to facilitate creating combined purchase order information; and forwarding said combined purchase order information from said hub server to said vendor web site.

None of Bezos, Erickson and Wiecha, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest every element recited in Claims 1, 7 and 18. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Bezos describes an internet-based referral system that enables associate web sites to market products sold on a merchant's web site for a commission. Specifically, a customer may access an associate's web site (100) that includes a web server (116) and a catalog of documents (120) that is coupled to the web server (116). The associate web site (100) enables the customer to browse products for prospective purchase. Moreover, the associate's web site (100) includes a hyperlink for each displayed product. In the event the customer wishes to purchase a product, the customer selects the hyperlink. Upon selecting the hyperlink, **the customer is automatically connected to the merchant's web site (106) to enable the customer to purchase the product directly from the merchant's web site (106).**

Bezos does not teach or suggest receiving a purchase request at a hub server, wherein the purchase request originated from an affiliate web site. Moreover, Bezos does not teach or suggest combining the buyer's information with the selected product information to create a combined purchase request and forwarding that purchase request from the hub server to the vendor's web site, as described in Claims 1, 7 and 18. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the elements recited in Claims 1, 7 and 18 are not analogous to **automatically connecting a customer to a merchant's web site upon selecting a hyperlink associated with a product on**

an associate web site, wherein the customer completes the sale on the merchant's web site,
as taught by Bezos.

Erickson does not resolve the deficiencies of Bezos. Erickson describes a system for communication between a plurality of buyers and a plurality of suppliers to facilitate a bidding process. Specifically, Erickson describes a service provider (14) that collects information submitted by buyers (10) and suppliers (12) and stores the collected information in a central database (16). The collected information may be accessed through the service provider (14).

Similarly, Wiecha does not resolve the above-described deficiencies of Bezos and Erickson. Wiecha merely describes receiving processing and managing images (208) and text (212) from content providers (200) to create an electronic purchasing service ("EPS") master catalog. The EPS catalog is distributed to buyers (230) using an EPS subscription (228).

As a result, none of Bezos, Erickson and Wiecha, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest every element recited in Claims 1, 7 and 18. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 7 and 18 are patentable over Bezos in view of Erickson and further in view of Wiecha. Dependent Claims 2-4 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 1 and therefore incorporate all the elements of Claim 1. Dependent Claims 8-10 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 7 and therefore incorporate all the elements thereof. As a result, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-4 and 8-10 likewise are patentable over Bezos in view of Erickson and further in view of Wiecha.

The rejection of Claims 5, 6, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bezos in view of Erickson and further in view of Wiecha and Chen, is

respectfully traversed. Claims 5 and 6 depend from independent Claim 1 and Claims 11 and 12 depend from independent Claim 7.

Independent Claims 1 and 7 are recited above. None of Bezos, Erickson, Wiecha and Chen, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest every element recited in Claims 1 and 7. Specifically, as discussed above, none of Bezos, Erickson and Wiecha, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest every element recited in Claims 1 and 7.

Chen does not resolve the deficiencies of Bezos, Erickson and Wiecha. Chen merely describes a system for automatically generating a style sheet and displaying scripts for a graphical user interface. As a result, none of Bezos, Erickson, Wiecha and Chen, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest every element recited in Claims 1 and 7. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1 and 7 are patentable over Bezos in view of Erickson and further in view of Wiecha and Chen. Dependent Claims 5 and 6 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 1 and therefore incorporate all the elements of Claim 1. Dependent Claims 11 and 12 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 7 and therefore incorporate all the elements thereof. As a result, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 5, 6, 11 and 12 likewise are patentable over Bezos in view of Erickson and further in view of Wiecha and Chen.

The rejection of Claims 19 and 21-30 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bezos in view of Wiecha and Hartman, is respectfully traversed. Claims 21, 22, 25 and 27 depend from independent Claim 19. Claims 24, 26 and 30 and depend from independent Claim 18. Claim 28 depends from independent Claim 1 and Claim 29 depends from independent Claim 7.

Independent Claims 1, 7 and 18 are recited above.

Claim 19 recites:

receiving at said hub server, a cookie, said cookie includes a prospective buyer identifier, an affiliate web site identifier and a product identifier; dynamically creating a <FORM> that includes purchase transaction information to facilitate transacting a purchase transaction; returning a picture of said product with a submit image and said <FORM> to said affiliate web site; receiving at said hub server said <FORM> from said affiliate web site; and forwarding from said hub server a purchase request for said product to be shipped to said buyer to a vendor web site.

Claim 23 recites:

sending a sale request that includes a buyer identifier, an affiliate web site identifier, a product identifier and a vendor web site identifier to said hub server in the event a buyer selects a vendor product displayed on said particular affiliate web site; searching a database at said hub server for a product picture, a current product price and previously stored buyer credit card information and shipping address associated with said buyer identifier; sending, from said hub server to said buyer at said particular affiliate web site, a form including said product picture, said current product price and a submit icon superimposed on said product picture; returning said form, from said buyer at said particular affiliate web site to said hub server, in the event said buyer clicks on said submit icon; debiting, at said hub server, said buyer's credit card with said purchase price; crediting said vendor web site with an amount that is substantially equal to said current product price less a commission credited to said particular affiliate web site; submitting from said hub server to said vendor web site information to facilitate transacting a purchase, wherein said information includes a product code, a product price, an affiliate web site identifier, a vendor web site identifier, a buyer identifier and shipping address; processing said sale request at said vendor web site; and shipping said product to said shipping address in said form.

None of Bezos, Wiecha and Hartman, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest every element recited in Claims 1, 7, 18, 19 and 23. Specifically, as discussed above,

neither Bezos nor Wiecha, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest every element recited in Claims 1, 7 and 18.

Hartman does not resolve the deficiencies of Bezos and Wiecha. Rather, Hartman merely describes a method and a system for single-action ordering of items in a client/server environment. To enable single-action ordering a client system displays information that identifies the item and displays an indication of an action, such as clicking a mouse, that a purchaser is to perform to order the identified item. As a result, none of Bezos, Wiecha and Hartman, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest every element recited in Claims 1, 7 and 18. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 7 and 18 are patentable over Bezos in view of Wiecha and Hartman. Dependent Claim 28 depends directly from independent Claim 1 and therefore incorporate all the elements of Claim 1. Dependent Claim 29 depends directly from independent Claim 7 and therefore incorporate all the elements thereof. Dependent Claims 24, 26 and 30 depend directly from independent Claim 18 and therefore incorporate all the elements of Claim 18. As a result, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 24, 26, 28, 29 and 30 likewise are patentable over Bezos in view of Wiecha and Hartman.

Turning to independent Claim 19, none of Bezos, Wiecha and Hartman, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest “receiving at said hub server, a cookie, said cookie includes a prospective buyer identifier, an affiliate web site identifier and a product identifier; dynamically creating a <FORM> that includes purchase transaction information to facilitate transacting a purchase transaction; returning a picture of said product with a submit image and said <FORM> to said affiliate web site; receiving at said hub server said <FORM> from said affiliate web site;

and forwarding from said hub server a purchase request for said product to be shipped to said buyer to a vendor web site” as recited in Claim 19.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 19 is patentable over Bezos in view of Wiecha and Hartman. Dependent Claims 21 and 22 depend directly from independent Claim 19 and therefore incorporate all the elements of Claim 19. As a result, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 21 and 22 likewise are patentable over Bezos in view of Wiecha and Hartman.

Turning to independent Claim 23, none of Bezos, Wiecha and Hartman, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest “sending a sale request that includes a buyer identifier, an affiliate web site identifier, a product identifier and a vendor web site identifier to said hub server in the event a buyer selects a vendor product displayed on said particular affiliate web site; searching a database at said hub server for a product picture, a current product price and previously stored buyer credit card information and shipping address associated with said buyer identifier; sending, from said hub server to said buyer at said particular affiliate web site, a form including said product picture, said current product price and a submit icon superimposed on said product picture; returning said form, from said buyer at said particular affiliate web site to said hub server, in the event said buyer clicks on said submit icon; debiting, at said hub server, said buyer's credit card with said purchase price; crediting said vendor web site with an amount that is substantially equal to said current product price less a commission credited to said particular affiliate web site; submitting from said hub server to said vendor web site information to facilitate transacting a purchase, wherein said information includes a product code, a product price, an affiliate web site identifier, a vendor web site identifier, a buyer identifier and shipping address . . .” as recited in Claim 23.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 23 is patentable over Bezos in view of Wiecha and Hartman.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests that the 103 rejections of Claims 1-12, 18, 19 and 21-30 be withdrawn.

Newly Added Claims

Claims 31-33 have been newly added. Claim 31 depends directly from independent Claim 1, Claim 32 depends directly from independent Claim 7 and Claim 33 depends directly from independent Claim 19. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added.

As discussed above, Applicant submits that independent Claims 1, 7 and 19 are in condition for allowance. Since the newly dependent claims incorporate all the elements of their respective independent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that newly added Claims 31-33 likewise are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, at the telephone number listed below.

Very truly yours,
MAIER & MAIER, PLLC

/Timothy J. Maier/
Timothy J. Maier
Registration No. 51,986

Maier & Maier, PLLC
1000 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 740-8322

Date: February 11, 2009